

## REMARKS

This response is to the official action mailed on the above-referenced case on 06/05/2006. In the action the Examiner objects to the specification for informalities. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9 and 10 are objected to by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah (US 6,615,199) hereinafter Bowman-Amuah.

In response to the Examiner's rejections and objections, applicant herein amends the claims to overcome the 101 and 112 rejections. Applicant also herein amends the specification, as required by the Examiner. Applicant does not amend the claims to overcome the art. Applicant provides detailed arguments which clearly show that the art of Bowman-Amuah fails to teach or suggest applicant's invention, as claimed.

Regarding the 102 rejection the Examiner states that; "Bowman-Amuah teaches all of the limitations of applicant's claimed invention, providing considerable detail. Applicant points out that applicant's invention teaches a specifically claims a software instance operating on a computer platform including a model framework for generating batch programs comprising: an abstraction representing a batch program; an abstraction representing a batch function of the program; an abstraction representing operation of the function; an abstraction representing a data provider to the function; and an abstraction representing a context class of the function; characterized in that an instantiation process of the model is initiated with appropriate input data parameters input to each abstraction generates appropriate instances of batch functions including function operations wherein the generated instances are executable as part of a run sequence of the batch program.

Applicant asserts that Bowman-Amuah teaches an extensive information processing system which fails to teach generating software creating batch programs from a plurality of modular abstractions as claimed. Bowman-Amuah teaches (FIG. 54-55) a method 5400 for providing an abstraction factory pattern. Data is received and transformed into a plurality of concrete objects in operations 5402 and 5404. Each of the concrete objects is associated with an abstract interface in operation 5406. A map of the association between the concrete objects and the abstract interface is created in operation 5408. In operation 5410, when request is received which includes an identifier for one of the concrete objects and an identifier for the abstract interface. The map is consulted to locate the concrete object that has been identified in operation 5412. An abstract object is then created that corresponds to the located concrete object in operation 5414 (col. 195, lines 39-52). Block 5504 of Fig. 55 clearly shows that the abstractions are generated to provide information to the batch jobs. Bowman-Amuah teaches a process for creating abstractions for data used in a batch program. We create abstractions representing modular portions of the batch program, wherein when instantiated generates the batch program itself.

Applicant argues that abstractions representing a batch program; a batch function of the program; operation of the function; a data provider to the function; and an abstraction representing a context class of the function is clearly not taught in Bowman-Amuah. Bowman-Amuah may present similar terms used in applicant's claim language, but fails to show the specific order and process as claimed, which must be present in the art to support a 102 rejection.

Applicant believes independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable as argued above. Dependent claims 2-7 and 9-11 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

If there are any time extensions required for response in addition to any extension petitioned and paid with this response, such petition is requested, and if there are any fees due over any fees paid with this response, authorization is given to deduct the fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully submitted,  
Viney Vasant Kulkarni et al.

By *Donald R. Boys*  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.  
3 Hangar Way, Suite D  
Watsonville, CA 95076  
8931-768-1755